

**Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan
Preferred Alternative Subcommittee Meeting
May 4, 2004**

Location: Crook County Library 1-3

Present:

Clay Penhollow
Anne Holmquist
Mimi Graves
Ed Faulkner
Jerry Cordova
Sarah Thomas

Bill McCaffrey
Darrell Pieper
Russ Frost
Barbara Pieper
Dave Duncan
Katy Yoder

BLM: Teal Purrington, facilitator; Virginia Gibbons record on the board, Mollie Chaudet, Ryan Franklin

Teal: Introductions, agenda review

Topics: Minerals and Military

Mollie Chaudet noted that the next two meetings would wrap up the presentations before we went back to the larger group. The next two meeting would be presentations for changes to the Preferred Alternative developed by focus groups rather than the BLM IDT. These are smaller groups that got together to address technical details and work them out prior to the presentation. In many cases, we will be getting the big picture of what they agreed to rather than the technical details that they may have worked out.

Minerals Presentation—Ryan Franklin

Summary of Public Comments:

Several comments were received regarding minerals.

- No substantive changes. The minerals-related comments only resulted in clarifications and/or technical corrections. That means there are no issues brought forward that the subcommittee needs to reach consensus on.
- No changes to the number of acres available for mineral material sales.
- **There was one internal change to the land allocations for minerals; the buffer around the wagon roads was decreased from 1 mile to ½ mile.**

Summary of Comments:

Major categories:

1. No new mineral material sites should be authorized in the Cline Buttes or O'Neil areas.

General Response:

- The RMP specifies the areas that are available for mineral material site development and does not authorize any specific mining operation.
 - All new proposals are subject to an environmental analysis including notification of the interested and affected public and opportunities for public comment. This process determines whether new site proposals will be approved.
 - O'Neil and Cline Buttes have known deposits of high quality rock and much of the Cline Buttes block is closed or has special restrictions. A complete closure of these areas does not represent a reasonable balance of uses.
2. Prefer no mining in Cline Buttes, but can live with mining Site N on the condition that truck traffic exits by Hwy 126 via Barr Road.

General Response: See response for (1).

- The environmental review may result in truck traffic restrictions on roads under BLM jurisdiction.
3. The 1/8-mile buffer around the perimeter of residentially zoned areas is not large enough.

General Response: See response for (1).

- The 1/8-mile (660 ft) buffer is similar to county regulations:
 - Crook County – 500 ft from noise and dust-sensitive uses.
 - Deschutes County – ¼ mile (1320 ft) from noise and dust-sensitive uses.
 - If the proposed site is close to a residential area, the environmental review may result in a setback of more than 1/8 mile.
4. Too much area is open to mineral material site development.

General Response:

- Most BLM-administered lands within the Planning Area are either too far from likely construction sites or do not have sufficient rock quality to be developed.

- Up to 80 acres of ground disturbance are expected to occur during the life of this plan. This is less than .02 % (2 100ths of 1%) of the planning area.

Technical Correction Examples

1. The plan seems to treat recreation and mining as always being in conflict.
 - There is a footnote under Table 2-12 (DEIS Vol. 2; page 85) that states, "Designated recreation sites that depend upon or exist in mineral material sites generally will not be considered to be in conflict with mining operations for the purposes of setting up a buffer zone." This language will be added to the main text of the FEIS.
2. The numbers used for minerals in the Socio-Econ report were questioned in the comments.
 - A number of mathematical errors and invalid assumptions were found, resulting in a nearly complete rewrite of the Socio-Econ effects for minerals.
3. The hourly and daily restrictions for mining and blasting were misinterpreted to be rigid regulations.
 - The language was modified to more clearly present these restrictions as guidelines to be implemented on a case by case basis.

Questions/Responses

BLM cannot control use of Barr Rd.? *correct*

If a road goes through land managed by BLM the BLM can't control use if another government has a right of way? *No. Generally BLM does not have jurisdiction over county roads, state highways. It depends upon the nature of the ROW grant. If BLM authorizes development on BLM lands, they would have some ability to say how that development would occur.*

Does eagle Crest have an interest in site N? *Don't know. No indication in our records. Site N has the least conflicts with residents associated with it when compared with other sites.*

Concern about spread of effects to private lands, via travel paths?

Question: Language concerning recreation —is it limited to shooting and ohv use? *No.*

No need for consensus since there are no changes in alternatives.

Military Focus Group Summary

Summary of Comments:

- Steamboat Rock is not very suitable for military uses
 - The area does not meet the needs of military training mission because its size and encumbrances make it is too restrictive for training exercises.
- Expansion of Area “E” would enhance training opportunities
- Restoration for “rotation areas” not clearly defined
 - The beneficial contributions done by the military, specifically, restoration activities.
 - Lacking conclusions about how successful these efforts have been.
 - Lacking specifics about how acquiring more information is improving results.
- Concerns about winter use in Millican Plateau area
- Terms and Conditions for use of areas not clear in objectives/guidelines
- Objectives to restore and clean up dump areas do not reflect military training needs

Proposed Changes

Clarification of objectives:

- Providing land for military use that will meet their training needs.
- Establishing clear parameters that enable the military to meet its training objectives and RMP objectives for restoration, resource management and other land uses.

Changes to Alternatives:

- Area available for training activities
- Concept of “rotation areas”, and restoration requirements
- Provide for exception to season of use restrictions in areas 2 and 3.

Changes in Objectives and Guidelines:

- Objectives and guidelines have added text to provide direction for terms and conditions of uses

Specific Changes

1. Area available for training activities
 - a. Drop “Steamboat Rock” area
 - i. Does not meet needs of military
 - ii. OMD is willing to do some work to improve the site, but those activities are more appropriate as a request by BLM to the National Guard as a cleanup day
 - b. Modify area “E” to include additional area
 - i. The requested change better centers the training activities around the one road the military is permitted to use

2. Concept of “rotation areas”
 - a. Change rotation concept to “satellite” concept, such that:
 - i. area 2 provides an alternative training area for the type of maneuvers that occur in area D of the core area
 - ii. area 3 provides an alternative training area for the type of maneuvers that occur in area E of the core area
 - b. Use of areas 2 and 3 based on training needs and condition of area.

Note: Under all alternatives uses of areas are limited to a company or smaller operation. Larger operations could be considered anywhere in planning area subject to site-specific analysis.
 - c. Establish “baseline” conditions prior to beginning training in areas 2 and 3. Restoration to “baseline” would determine when and whether continued training activities would be allowed in those areas.

Note: The establishment of baseline and how it will be measured has not yet been agreed to.
3. Allow for a possible waiver of seasonal restrictions (currently Dec 1 – April 30) to April 15 after consultation with BLM and ODFW to ensure that wildlife needs are provided.
4. Changes proposed to objectives and guidelines
 - a. Improve incorporation by reference of guidelines which refer to the INRMP, ICRMP, and '95 EA, all of which describe the history of rehabilitation actions
 - b. Drop Objectives related to cleaning up and restoring recreation and dumping areas (note these are now a subset of the second objective).
 - c. Include appropriate land use plan terms and conditions from existing permit to clarify conditions of uses allowed in each area.

Questions: are wildlife concerns resolved—Jerry yes

Will military have to do more before they can actually use 2 and 3—yes area needs to be incorporated into INRMP and CRMP. Review of on ground conditions.

CONSENSUS AGREEMENT ON ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CHANGE

Open Public Forum

No members of the public were present. Alternate members of the Issue Team were invited to join the table, or contribute in any way.